



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/808,125	03/24/2004	Bruce Nelsen Rogers	PC27966A (1594.US1)	4535
23913	7590	04/23/2008	EXAMINER	
PFIZER INC			MORRIS, PATRICIA L	
Steve T. Zelson			ART UNIT	
150 EAST 42ND STREET			PAPER NUMBER	
5TH FLOOR - STOP 49			1625	
NEW YORK, NY 10017-5612			MAIL DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			04/23/2008	
			PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/808,125	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ROGERS ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Patricia L. Morris	<b>Art Unit</b> 1625	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 is/are pending in the application.  
     4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-51 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
     a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Election/Restriction***

This application has been found to contain more than one invention. Therefore, restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-40, drawn to compounds,, classified in classes 540, 544, 546, 548 and 549, various subclasses
- II. Claim 41, drawn to compositions containing an additional active ingredient, classified in class 514, various subclasses.
- III. Claims 42-51, drawn to multiple uses, classified in class 514, various subclasses.

These inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

These distinct inventions have acquired separate status in the art, will support separate patents, and will require different fields of search for the respective inventions. Accordingly, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is considered proper; 35 U.S.C. 121; 37 CFR 1.141; 37 CFR 1.142.

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the products as claimed can be used in materially different processes as evidenced by applicants' own claims and specification.

Inventions I and II are unrelated because the compounds of invention I and II do not require an additional active ingredient for their uses.

In the event of an election of either Groups I or III, applicants are required to elect a single disclosed species representative of the claimed invention since the compounds do not even belong to a recognized class of compounds because all the variables vary. The claimed compounds encompass all heterocyclic chemistry classified in classes 540, 544, 546, 548 and 549, various subclasses. The staggering arrangement of possibilities does not permit classification of the claimed subject matter. Each heterocycle represents an independent and patentably distinct invention.

Should applicant(s) traverse on the ground that the species inventions identified are not patentably distinct, applicants should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the above identified species inventions to be obvious variants, or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, of traverse, if the examiner finds one of the inventions in the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

A Markush-type claim is directed to an independent and distinct inventions if two or more of its members are so unrelated and diverse that a prior art reference anticipating the claim with respect to one of the members would not render the claim obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103 with respect to the other member(s). In re Weber, 198 USPQ 330, footnote 3.

A reference to an oxazolepyridine here would not be a reference to a pyridine. When one writes out the entire compound, as a whole, one arrives at patentably distinct compounds, along the lines indicated in the Groups of the first page of this action.

Independent means the compound is capable of being utilized alone, not in combination with other compounds listed in the Markush expression; MPEP 802.01.

If the members are so diverse that they will support separate patents, *i.e.*, a reference for one would not constitute a reference for the other, then restriction is considered proper. MPEP 2173.05(h).

Claims 1-40 will be examined to the extent readable on the elected compounds.

In the event of an election of Group III, applicants are also requested to elect a single disclosed method, *i.e.*, a specific disease.

In the event of an election of Group II, applicants are requested to elect a single disclosed composition, *i.e.*, compound plus additional active ingredient.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder. All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is *presented prior to* final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection

Art Unit: 1625

are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be **allowable**, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained.

Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b).

Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** *Applicants are reminded of propriety of process of use claims in consideration of the “reach-through” format, which is drawn to mechanistic, receptor binding or enzymatic functionality. Reach through claims are considered lacking of descriptive and enabling support from the specification.* Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

In, In re Weber, 198 USPQ 332, In re Hengehold, 169 USPQ 473, was noted for the proposition that as long as applicants have maintained the right (as they do here) to file the non-elected subject matter in divisional applications, then restriction is proper, as to that point.

Applicant may file the divisional subject matter noted in divisional applications. If applicant wishes a generic expression of the elected invention the claims here need be amended to reflect that election.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Morris whose telephone number is (571) 272-0688. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays through Fridays.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1625

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Patricia L. Morris/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1625

plm  
April 21, 2008